

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action of May 18, 2007 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Applicants note that the undersigned is new counsel of record pursuant to the Power of Attorney filed August 30, 2007. Claims 1, 7-9, 17, 21-24 and 31 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and new claims 39-47 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 7-10, 12, 13, 17, 21-24, 26-29, 31, and 39-47 thus remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 7-10, 12, 13, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 31 to present the claims in a more preferred form. Specifically, amended claims 1 and 31 recite displaying the reduced video image of real-time programming in “the first of the individual image areas,” rather than “in each of the individual image areas” as previously recited. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 31, as well as their respective dependent claims, are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 17, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,371 (Lee), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,669 (Sundqvist). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part, “identifying a most presentable snapshot from the plurality of snapshots captured from the video stream.” In the rejection of pre-amended claim 1, the Office Action alleges that Lee discloses determining that a snapshot is the most presentable snapshot captured from the video stream at col. 5, lines 35-39. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Lee. The relied-upon section of Lee is reproduced below:

information memory **31**. The broadcasting guide controller **34** also extracts video information for displaying PIP videos, ³⁵ and controls the PIP processor **33** to perform PIP video processing and to store PIP processed video information in the PIP video memory **32**.

This section of Lee describes a general technique for extracting and storing PIP video information, and subsequent sections of Lee (e.g., col. 6, lines 17-48) describe displaying either a “still video” or “moving video” for a program in a PIP display. However, neither of these sections discloses determining that a snapshot is the most presentable snapshot, as is argued by the Office Action. Furthermore, neither these sections nor any other section of Lee that the Applicants have identified teaches or suggests, “identifying a most presentable snapshot from the plurality of snapshots captured from the video stream,” as recited in claim 1. In fact, Lee never discloses taking a plurality of snapshots from a video stream, and does not even contemplate identifying a “most presentable” snapshot from such a plurality. Sundqvist relates to detecting a scene change, but also fails to teach or suggest, “identifying a most presentable snapshot from the plurality of snapshots captured from the video stream.” Therefore, neither Lee nor Sundqvist, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests every feature of amended claim 1. As such, claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited art.

Amended independent claims 17 and 31 also each recite “identify[ing] a most presentable snapshot from the plurality of snapshots captured from the video stream.” Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, amended claims 17 and 31 are not obvious in view of the cited references.

Dependent claims 7-10, 12, 13, 21-24, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Sundqvist, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,870,573 (Yeo). However, Yeo fails to overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Lee and Sundqvist, in that Yeo also does not teach or suggest identifying a most presentable snapshot from the plurality of snapshots captured from the video stream. Therefore, dependent claims 7-10, 12, 13, 21-24, and 26-29 are not obvious in view of the cited references for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

For example, claims 7 and 21 recite “comparing contrast levels among the plurality of snapshots and determining that the most presentable snapshot has a best contrast,” amended

claims 8 and 22 recite, “comparing brightness levels among the plurality of snapshots and determining that the most presentable snapshot has a median brightness,” and amended claims 9 and 23 recite, “comparing color saturation levels among the plurality of snapshots and determining that the most presentable snapshot has a highest color saturation.” The Office Action alleges that these features are disclosed by Yeo in FIGS. 6 and 9 and at col. 9, lines 9 and 19-21. However, the relied-upon sections of Yeo only describe adjusting display parameters of images; they do not disclose comparing contrast levels, brightness levels, or color saturation levels among a plurality of snapshots. Moreover, Yeo only generically describes adjusting the “parameters” of a display. None of the specific terms “contrast”, “brightness”, or “color saturation” are even mentioned in Yeo’s disclosure. Therefore, dependent claims 7-9 and 21-23 are not obvious in view of the cited references for at least these additional reasons.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 39-47. No new matter has been added. While Applicants note that new claims 39-47 have not been rejected, the following remarks are submitted in the interest of expediting prosecution.

Claims 39, 42, and 45 depend respectively from base claims 1, 17, and 32, and further recite displaying “a graphical representation of a polyhedron” on the EPG display, wherein the image (or snapshot) associated with the selected channel is displayed “on one side of the polyhedron.” Claims 40, 43, and 46 depend respectively from claims 39, 42, and 45, and further recite displaying an additional image “corresponding to a different selected channel” on “a different side of the polyhedron.” Claims 41, 44, and 47 depend respectively from claims 40, 43, and 46, and further recite receiving “a user request to rotate the polyhedron to display information corresponding to the different selected channel,” and updating the EPG display “by rotating the graphical representation of the polyhedron so that a greater portion of the polyhedron side corresponding to the different selected channel is displayed in the first of the individual image areas.” Neither Lee nor Sunqvist nor Yeo teaches or suggests displaying an EPG with a graphical representation of polyhedron, or that different sides of the polyhedron are used to display images associated with different selected channels. Furthermore, none of the cited references teaches or suggests receiving a user request to rotate a polyhedron to display an image

associated with a different selected channel in an EPG display. Therefore, claims 39-47 are allowable over the cited references for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 31st day of October, 2007

By: /Brian J. Brisnehan/
Brian Brisnehan, Registration No. 60,462
1100 13th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3324
Fax: (202) 824-3001